

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Glover
Vice Chairman Chaney (late)
Mr. Beyer
Mrs. Ham
Mrs. Hayes
Mr. Hickey
Mr. Malone
Mr. Nicholas
Mr. Prengaman
Mr. Robinson
Mr. Sader

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

GUESTS PRESENT: Andrew P. Grose, Research Director, LCB

Chairman Glover called the meeting to order at 3:06 p.m. in room 200. He informed the committee that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss Congressional reapportionment and that there were two conceptual ideas, one to split the state on a north-south line dividing Clark County in half and Reno along the Truckee River; the second to form a Congressional District in metropolitan Clark County minus 60,000 people out of the county to be included with the rest of the state.

Mr. Andrew P. Grose, Research Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, reminded the committee of their previous decision to form Assembly Districts from which to build Senate Districts and ultimately establish Congressional Districts. He pointed out a refinement of Clark County plan #2 that was based on the recommendations of the Clark County Delegation. Within this plan he noted that there are 24 Assembly districts in Clark County adjusted to overcome most of the conflicts, that the numbers are correct with the exception of one district in Henderson and one in the city that are too high but can easily be corrected.

Mr. Grose continued saying that assuming, for purposes of discussion, recognizing there will likely be more changes, that this is the Assembly plan, the Congressional plan can be applied in one of two ways: 1) Metropolitan Las Vegas as one district with the balance of Clark County and the rest of the state as the second district which would mean taking the equivalent of three Assembly districts from Clark County and attaching them to the rest of the state. He noted that these three districts must not only be attachable geographically but also logically from a political, economic and social standpoint; that two of the most logical would probably be

the present outlying districts, #21 and #22, Henderson and the valleys, encompassing 39,000 people. He indicated that for the third Assembly district in terms of contiguity it could be District #17 or any on the edge of the map, but in terms of rural character, such as found in the other two, it would most likely be District #1 extending from the Moapa line to California and down and around through Goodsprings thus forming, except for Searchlight, a doughnut around an in-town Congressional district.

Mr. Hickey said that if consideration is to be given to forming Clark County as one Congressional entity, a subcommittee should be appointed to gather input from the city and county officials and residents resulting in a unified voice for decision.

Mr. Grose addressed the second Congressional plan which would split Clark County on a north-south line and Reno on an east-west line along the Truckee River. He outlined on the Las Vegas map where this line would zigzag through the city indicating where the districts would fall. He added that any twelve Assembly districts can be incorporated in one block and the numbers will be right for a split of Clark County.

In response to a question from Dr. Robinson, Mr. Grose noted that this zigzag line does coincide with the boundaries of the proposed Assembly districts.

Mr. Glover asked if taking three Assembly Districts from Clark County would result in one Senate district being partly in one Congressional district and partly in the other. Mr. Grose replied that there was no way to avoid this. When Mr. Glover asked how close the numbers must be, Mr. Grose responded within one percent or 7,000.

Dr. Robinson commented that this was not a Clark County Congressional District but a Congressional District within Clark County and that he favored an east-west split where the districts were more or less statewide.

Mr. Glover felt that a conceptual decision should be made as to whether the committee wants a metropolitan Clark County district for one district or two "statewide" districts.

When Mr. Hickey said that this should not be a decision made by Clark County alone and that he would like to hear comments from Washoe County, Mr. Glover indicated that he could not speak for Washoe County but that most of the people that he had spoken with from the north were not in favor of splitting Reno.

Mr. Sader said that he thought that was an accurate appraisal but suggested gathering input from these areas before making any decisions.

In discussion the committee felt that the Washoe delegation, the Clark County delegation, the small counties, the Democratic party and the Republican party should be polled for input.

Dr. Robinson questioned the advisability of having one Congressman whose primary concern was urban Las Vegas and said that he would rather have two Congressmen who would represent the entire state, who would be aware of mining and agricultural problems as well as urban problems.

Mr. Malone commented that in cutting the state in half vertically the two Congressmen would most likely be from Clark County because that is where most of the population is now and will increase in the future.

Mrs. Hayes pointed out that the majority of the population has been in Clark County for a number of years but that our present Governor is from the north, one of our senators is from the north, and the secretary of state is from the north. She suggested forgetting the "civil war" in the state and deciding what would be best for all of the people.

Mr. Prengaman agreed with Mr. Malone and noted that campaign contributions are much greater in the south than in the north.

Mr. Hickey referred to EXHIBIT A of the minutes of March 16, 1981 which is a breakdown of residency of elected officials from 1952 to 1980. He stressed that regardless of area and population, it is really the man, the candidate, that we are electing.

Mr. Prengaman commented that it did not make sense to take a small city like Reno and split it in half. He also pointed out that Las Vegas has a far greater potential for growth than the Reno area.

Mrs. Hayes said that the committee was underestimating the voters, that people voted for the person not for an area.

Mr. Glover requested that caucuses be held of the Clark County delegation, the Washoe County delegation, the small county delegation, the republican party and the democratic party and that a consensus of each group be reported back to the committee next week.

Mr. Hickey referred to EXHIBIT A of the minutes of February 16, 1981 which is an analysis and list of Congressional campaign expenditures in different states and different elections. He suggested the committee peruse this report.

Dr. Robinson suggested that Mr. Grose examine these two proposed Congressional districts from a political registration point of view to make sure that a district is not being formed that is of one particular political persuasion.

When Mr. Glover questioned the time frame involved in the drafting of bills once decisions have been made, Mr. Grose explained that it will take at least one week for bill drafting. 182

Since there was no further discussion on Congressional reapportionment, Mr. Glover asked Mr. Grose to explain the Carson City reapportionment plan.

Mr. Grose explained all plans have indicated that some population must be added to Carson City to form a Senate district and two Assembly districts. He indicated that there are 32,000 people in Carson City so therefore a minimum of 4,000 people must come from some other source which could be part of the Washoe Valley, Storey County or some of Dayton. He added that these are the only options because of the way the enumeration districts fall in Douglas County. He outlined on the map proposals for the two Assembly districts and the one Senate district incorporating population from Washoe Valley and Storey County.

Mr. Grose outlined some of the problems dealing with conflicts of incumbents and with Senate plans in the Clark County proposal but pointed out that these can be easily solved.

Mr. Grose continued by outlining the proposed Henderson plan. He said that in this plan Moapa and Goodsprings are attached to District #1 but there is a problem of too much population. Mr. Hickey said that he would work with all concerned and solve all of these problems.

Mr. Sader said that in Washoe County they have a consensus of Assemblyman on how the districts should be drawn but there may be conflict with the Senate plan.

Mr. Grose posted a map drawn by the computer given only the information of where incumbents live and pointed out the boundaries drawn by the computer which differ greatly from the plan suggested by the Washoe delegation.

Since there was no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Hatch

Patricia Hatch
Secretary

ASSEMBLY

AGENDA FOR COMMITTEE ON..... ELECTIONS.....

Date MONDAY, APRIL 13 Time 3:00 p.m. Room 200.....

Bills or Resolutions
to be considered

Subject

Counsel
requested*

GENERAL DISCUSSION OF CONGRESSIONAL REAPPORTIONMENT

*Please do not ask for counsel unless necessary.